



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,296	09/15/2003	Aman Naimat	021756-003000US	2613
51206	7590	11/24/2009		
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP/ORACLE TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER 8TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			EXAMINER REYES, MARIELA D	
			ART UNIT 2167	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/24/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/663,296	<b>Applicant(s)</b> NAIMAT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Mariela D. Reyes	<b>Art Unit</b> 2167	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 August 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-7,9,10 and 12-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 10 and 12-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

This Office Action has been issued in response to the amendment filed on August 10, 2009. Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 10 and 12-15 are pending. Applicant's arguments have been carefully and respectfully considered.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities: the word generating is misspelled. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim reads "...to assess a quality of of the potential..." the word of is duplicate. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The instant claims recite defining a type of test that will be applied to an attribute however there is no further mention in the claims of what this test could consist of, such as comparison, arithmetic test, etc.

Claims 1, 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The instant claims recite assessing a quality to the sales lead however there is no mention of how this is done.

Claims 1 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The instant claim recites an overall assessed quality, there is no mention of this overall assessed quality in the specification therefore it is unclear if the overall quality relates to a particular sales lead when compared to a rule or to a particular sales lead when compared with a plurality of other sale leads.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 9, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seibel et al (US Patent 7,096,220) in view of Andrews et al (US PG Pub 2002/0077998) and Cook et al (US Patent 6,820,082).

With respect to independent claim 1:

Seibel teaches:

**A computer implemented method of evaluating sales leads stored in a data source, the method comprising:**

**Forwarding, from a source computer system, information that configures a destination computer to display a first graphical user interface** (Column 2 Lines 47-48, discloses a web based ASP, therefore the information is sent from a source to a destination)

**Forwarding, from a source computer system, information that configures a destination computer to display a second graphical user interface** (Column 2 Lines 47-48, discloses a web based ASP, therefore the information is sent from a source to a destination) **allowing a user of the destination computer system to define a plurality of rules** (criteria) **that operate on data formatted according to the data format to assess a quality of the potential sales leads,** (Column 2 Lines 61-63, discloses a client defining a criteria that will be executed on data that will be retrieved based on how well it matches (quality) the criteria) **wherein each rule in the plurality of rules defines:**

**Information indicative of at least one attribute of the data formatted according to the data format on which the rule operates;** (Column 2 Lines 9-10, discloses the criteria including criteria)

**Information indicative of an expression that defines a type of test that will be applied to the at least one attribute, and** (Column 2 Lines 9-12, discloses matching (type of test) the attribute to the stored prospect's attributes)

**Information configured to assess a quality of the at least one attribute of the data satisfied by the rule;** (Column 9 Lines 12-14, discloses receiving the results of the test and a link that will be used to verify quality)

**Forwarding, from a source computer system, information that configures a destination computer to display a third graphical user interface** (Column 2 Lines 47-48, discloses a web based ASP, therefore the information is sent from a source to a destination) **allowing a user of the destination computer system to map data identifying a plurality of sales leads from the selected data source to the data format;** (Column 3 Lines 1-6, discloses mapping the received leads to the specific industry)

**Executing, with the computer system, the plurality of rules on the mapped data to produce a set of analyzed data that allows evaluation of potential sales leads according to an overall assessed quality of each potential sales lead in the mapped data.** (Column 2 Lines 11-17)

Seibel does not appear to explicitly disclose **allowing a user of the destination computer system to define a data format for the sales leads stored in the data source and select at least one of a database option and a spreadsheet file option presented by the first graphical user interface for the data source, the data format indicative of potential sales leads including at least a first name, a last name, an email address; and depending upon an outcome of the execution of the plurality of rules, generating with the computer system information sorting the analyzed data into at least a first bucket in which the mapped data passed each of the**

**executed plurality of rules and a second bucket in which the mapped data failed to pass each of the executed plurality of rules.**

Andrews teaches **allowing a user of the destination computer system to define a data format for the sales leads stored in the data source and select at least one of a database option and a spreadsheet file option presented by the first graphical user interface for the data source;** (Paragraphs [0079-0081], disclose that the sales leads will include data that will be divided into different formats depending on the organization it is directed to and that the user can define said data formats) **the data format indicative of potential sales leads including at least a first name, a last name, an email address.** (Fig. 4m discloses that the data includes the name and the email)

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement **allowing a user of the destination computer system to define a data format for the sales leads stored in the data source and select at least one of a database option and a spreadsheet file option presented by the first graphical user interface for the data source, the data format indicative of potential sales leads including at least a first name, a last name, an email address** so that the data can be manipulated and analyzed for commerce purposes. (As presented in Andrews)

The combination of Seibel and Andrews does not appear to explicitly disclose **depending upon an outcome of the execution of the plurality of rules, generating with the computer system information sorting the analyzed data into at least a**

**first bucket in which the mapped data passed each of the executed plurality of rules and a second bucket in which the mapped data failed to pass each of the executed plurality of rules.**

Cook teaches **depending upon an outcome of the execution of the plurality of rules, generating with the computer system information sorting the analyzed data into at least a first bucket in which the mapped data passed each of the executed plurality of rules and a second bucket in which the mapped data failed to pass each of the executed plurality of rules.** (Column 5 Lines 41-67, discloses based on the rules sorting the data in either data that can be accessed (passed all the rules) or data that can't be accessed (failed all the rules))

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement **depending upon an outcome of the execution of the plurality of rules, generating with the computer system information sorting the analyzed data into at least a first bucket in which the mapped data passed each of the executed plurality of rules and a second bucket in which the mapped data failed to pass each of the executed plurality of rules** because this would allow users to receive only the information for which they have sufficient privileges and are interested on accessing.

With respect to claim 3:

Seibel teaches:



**The data source is a heterogeneous data source.** (Column 6 Lines 23-36)

With respect to claim 5:

Seibel teaches:

**The plurality of rules that can be defined by a user include spatial rules, age/lineage rules, pattern-based rules, electronic validation rules and numeric operator-based rules.** (Column 5 Lines 52-57)

With respect to independent claim 9:

Seibel teaches:

**A computer implemented method of evaluating sales leads stored in a data source, the method comprising:**

**Forwarding, from a source computer system, information that configures a destination computer to display a first graphical user interface** (Column 2 Lines 47-48, discloses a web based ASP, therefore the information is sent from a source to a destination)

**Forwarding, from a source computer system, information that configures a destination computer to display a second graphical user interface** (Column 2 Lines 47-48, discloses a web based ASP, therefore the information is sent from a source to a destination) **allowing a user of the destination computer system to define a plurality of rules (criteria) that operate on data formatted according to the data**

**format to assess a quality of the potential sales leads,** (Column 2 Lines 61-63, discloses a client defining a criteria that will be executed on data that will be retrieved based on how well it matches (quality) the criteria) **wherein each rule in the plurality of rules defines:**

**Information indicative of at least on attribute of the data formatted according to the data format on which the rule operates;** (Column 2 Lines 9-10, discloses the criteria including criteria)

**Information indicative of an expression that defines a type of test that will be applied to the at least one attribute, and** (Column 2 Lines 9-12, discloses matching (type of test) the attribute to the stored prospect's attributes)

**Information configured to assess a quality of the at least one attribute of the data satisfied by the rule;** (Column 9 Lines 12-14, discloses receiving the results of the test and a link that will be used to verify quality)

**Forwarding, from a source computer system, information that configures a destination computer to display a third graphical user interface** (Column 2 Lines 47-48, discloses a web based ASP, therefore the information is sent from a source to a destination) **allowing a user of the destination computer system to map data identifying a plurality of sales leads from the selected data source to the data format;** (Column 3 Lines 1-6, discloses mapping the received leads to the specific industry)

**Executing, with a computer system, the plurality of rules on the mapped data to score the mapped data and produce a set of analyzed data usable to assess a quality of potential sales leads in the data source. (Column 2 Lines 11-17)**

Seibel does not appear to explicitly disclose **allowing a user of the destination computer system to define a data format for the sales leads stored in the data source and select at least one of a database option and a spreadsheet file option presented by the first graphical user interface for the data source, the data format indicative of potential sales leads including at least a first name, a last name, an email address; and depending upon an outcome of the execution of the plurality of rules, generating with the computer system information sorting the analyzed data into at least a first bucket in which the mapped data passed each of the executed plurality of rules and a second bucket in which the mapped data failed to pass each of the executed plurality of rules.**

Andrews teaches **allowing a user of the destination computer system to define a data format for the sales leads stored in the data source and select at least one of a database option and a spreadsheet file option presented by the first graphical user interface for the data source;** (Paragraphs [0079-0081], disclose that the sales leads will include data that will be divided into different formats depending on the organization it is directed to and that the user can define said data formats) **the data format indicative of potential sales leads including at least a first name, a last name, an email address. (Fig. 4m discloses that the data includes the name and the email)**

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement **allowing a user of the destination computer system to define a data format for the sales leads stored in the data source and select at least one of a database option and a spreadsheet file option presented by the first graphical user interface for the data source, the data format indicative of potential sales leads including at least a first name, a last name, an email address** so that the data can be manipulated and analyzed for commerce purposes. (As presented in Andrews)

The combination of Seibel and Andrews does not appear to explicitly disclose **depending upon an outcome of the execution of the plurality of rules, generating with the computer system information sorting the analyzed data into at least a first bucket in which the mapped data passed each of the executed plurality of rules and a second bucket in which the mapped data failed to pass each of the executed plurality of rules.**

Cook teaches **depending upon an outcome of the execution of the plurality of rules, generating with the computer system information sorting the analyzed data into at least a first bucket in which the mapped data passed each of the executed plurality of rules and a second bucket in which the mapped data failed to pass each of the executed plurality of rules.** (Column 5 Lines 41-67, discloses based on the rules sorting the data in either data that can be accessed (passed all the rules) or data that can't be accessed (failed all the rules))

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement **depending upon an outcome of the execution of the plurality of rules, generating with the computer system information sorting the analyzed data into at least a first bucket in which the mapped data passed each of the executed plurality of rules and a second bucket in which the mapped data failed to pass each of the executed plurality of rules** because this would allow users to receive only the information for which they have sufficient privileges and are interested on accessing.

With respect to claim 12:

Seibel teaches:

**The plurality of rules include age/lineage rules and numeric operator-based rules.** (Column 5 Lines 52-57)

With respect to independent claim 13:

Seibel teaches:

**A system for evaluating contacts stored in data sources, the system comprising:**

**A network; a set of one or more computers coupled to the network; a data source accessible to the set of computers over the network, the data source being one of a database and a spreadsheet file; (Fig. 4)**

**A first computer readable medium configured to store a user interface component executed by a computer and configured to allow one or more users of the computer to:**

**Define a plurality of rules that operate on data formatted according to the data format to assess a quality of the potential sales lead; (Column 2 Lines 61-63, discloses a client defining a criteria that will be executed on data that will be retrieved based on how well it matches (quality) the criteria wherein each rule in the plurality of rules defines;**

**Information indicative of at least one attribute of the data formatted according to the data format on which the rule operates; (Column 2 Lines 9-10, discloses the criteria including criteria)**

**Information indicative of an expression that defines a type of test that will be applied to the at least one attribute, and (Column 2 Lines 9-12, discloses matching (type of test) the attribute to the stored prospect's attributes)**

**Information configured to assess a quality of the at least one attribute of the data satisfied by the rule; (Column 9 Lines 12-14, discloses receiving the results of the test and a link that will be used to verify quality)**

**Map data identifying a plurality of sales leads from the selected data source to the data format;** (Column 3 Lines 1-6, discloses mapping the received leads to the specific industry)

**A second computer readable medium configured to store a rules engine component executed by one or more computers in the set of computers and configured to execute the plurality of rules on the mapped data to produce a set of analyzed data that allows evaluation of potential sales leads according to an overall assessed quality of each potential sales lead in the mapped data.** (Column 2 Lines 11-17)

Seibel does not appear to explicitly disclose **define a data format for the sales leads stored in the data source and select at least one of a database option and a spreadsheet file option presented by the first graphical user interface for the data source, the data format indicative of potential sales leads including at least a first name, a last name, an email address; and the rules engine being further configured to sort the analyzed data into at least a first bucket in which the mapped data passed each of the executed plurality of rules and a second bucket in which the mapped data failed to pass each of the executed plurality of rules.**

Andrews teaches **define a data format for the sales leads stored in the data source and select at least one of a database option and a spreadsheet file option presented by the first graphical user interface for the data source;** (Paragraphs [0079-0081], disclose that the sales leads will include data that will be divided into different formats depending on the organization it is directed to and that the user can

Art Unit: 2167

define said data formats) **the data format indicative of potential sales leads including at least a first name, a last name, an email address.** (Fig. 4m discloses that the data includes the name and the email)

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement **define a data format for the sales leads stored in the data source and select at least one of a database option and a spreadsheet file option presented by the first graphical user interface for the data source, the data format indicative of potential sales leads including at least a first name, a last name, an email address** so that the data can be manipulated and analyzed for commerce purposes. (As presented in Andrews)

The combination of Seibel and Andrews does not appear to explicitly disclose **the rules engine being further configured to sort the analyzed data into at least a first bucket in which the mapped data passed each of the executed plurality of rules and a second bucket in which the mapped data failed to pass each of the executed plurality of rules.**

Cook teaches **the rules engine being further configured to sort the analyzed data into at least a first bucket in which the mapped data passed each of the executed plurality of rules and a second bucket in which the mapped data failed to pass each of the executed plurality of rules.** (Column 5 Lines 41-67, discloses based on the rules sorting the data in either data that can be accessed (passed all the rules) or data that can't be accessed (failed all the rules))



It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement **the rules engine being further configured to sort the analyzed data into at least a first bucket in which the mapped data passed each of the executed plurality of rules and a second bucket in which the mapped data failed to pass each of the executed plurality of rules** because this would allow users to receive only the information for which they have sufficient privileges and are interested on accessing.

Claims 6, 7, 10, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seibel et al (US Patent 7,096,220) in view of Andrews et al (US PG Pub 200/0077998), Cook et al (US Patent 6, 820,082) and Fagin et al (US Patent 6,014,664).

With respect to claim 6:

The combination of Seibel, Andrews and Cook does not appear to explicitly disclose **the step of executing the plurality of rules comprises scoring the mapped data.**

Fagin teaches **the step of executing the plurality of rules comprises scoring the mapped data.** (Column 1 Lines 8-11, discloses that rules that will have scores assigned to them so that data can be assigned scores)

It would be obvious for someone with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement **the step of**

**executing the plurality of rules comprises scoring the mapped data** because this would help in the fact that then the user could have an idea of which results are more important.

With respect to claim 7:

The combination of Seibel, Andrews and Cook does not appear to explicitly disclose that **after executing the plurality of rules, allowing a user to rank data from the set of analyzed data according to its score.**

Fagin teaches that **after executing the plurality of rules, allowing a user to rank data from the set of analyzed data according to its score.** (Column 8 Lines 54-47, discloses that the user will create the scoring for each rule therefore the user is the one responsible for the ranking of the data)

With respect to claim 10:

The combination of Seibel, Andrews and Cook does not appear to explicitly disclose that **executing the plurality of rules comprises scoring the mapped data.**

Fagin teaches that **executing the plurality of rules comprises scoring the mapped data.** (Column 1 Lines 8-11, discloses that rules that will have scores assigned to them so that data can be assigned scores)

It would be obvious for someone with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement **executing the**

**plurality of rules comprises scoring the mapped data** because this would help in the fact that then the user could have an idea of which results are more important.

With respect to claim 14:

The combination of Seibel, Andrews and Cook does not appear to explicitly disclose that **the user interface component allows users to associate a score with each defined rule and wherein the rules engine component scores the mapped data during execution of the plurality of rules.**

Fagin teaches that **the user interface component allows users to associate a score with each defined rule and wherein the rules engine component scores the mapped data during execution of the plurality of rules.** (Column 1 Lines 8-11, discloses that rules that will have scores assigned to them so that data can be assigned scores)

With respect to claim 15:

The combination of Seibel, Andrews and Cook does not appear to explicitly disclose that **the user interface is further configured to allow a user to rank data from the set of analyzed data according to its score after the rules engine executes the plurality of rules.**

Fagin teaches that **the user interface is further configured to allow a user to rank data from the set of analyzed data according to its score after the rules engine executes the plurality of rules.** (Column 8 Lines 54-47, discloses that the user

will create the scoring for each rule therefore the user is the one responsible for the ranking of the data)

### ***Response to Arguments***

The following arguments are in response to the remarks filed on August 10, 2009.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Applicant's arguments have been carefully and respectfully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mariela D. Reyes whose telephone number is (571) 270-1006. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F 7:30- 5:00 East time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John R. Cottingham/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 2167

/Mariela D Reyes/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2167  
November 19, 2009